

Appl. No.: 09/833,173
Amdt. dated: 1/25/2006
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2005

REMARKS

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng, U.S. Patent No. 6,430,530 ("the Ng patent") in view of Iverson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,852,664 ("the Iverson, et al. patent"). It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As set forth in Section 2143 of the MPEP:

"To establish a prima face case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference, or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claim combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure."

It is respectfully submitted that neither the Ng nor the Iverson, et al. patent disclose all of the elements of the claims. Indeed, the claims recite a computer platform which includes a main process for running an audio or video playback application which also includes a peripheral bus that is not accessible by the audio or video playback application. The claims also recite a peripheral device which includes a separate processor and a peripheral bus interface for receiving

Appl. No.: 09/833,173
Amdt. dated: 1/25/2006
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2005

encrypted or encoded digital data from said peripheral bus and decrypting or decoding said data. Neither the Ng nor Iverson, et al. patents disclose such a structure. Indeed, it is clear that the secure architecture recited in the claims requires two separate processors, only one of which runs the audio or video playback application software. The Ng patent discloses a single process identified as the data processor 202. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Fig. 2 of the Ng patent. As shown in Fig. 2 and discussed in column 7, lines 16-30 of the Iverson, et al. patent, the decoder as well as the application program run on the same host processor 116. ("Video decoder 500 is preferably implemented in software on host processor 208 of Fig. 2. Decoder 500 receives an access word, for example, in a message from an application program running on the host processor (step 602 of Fig. 6)"). Iverson, et al., column 7, lines 21-25.

Thus, it should be clear that the Iverson, et al. patent teaches running the application program and the decoding application on the same processor; different than the system recited in the claims at issue. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the Iverson, et al. patent actually teaches away from the invention recited in the claims.

The Ng patent, on the other hand, discloses a single processor. Unlike the structure recited in the claims, it does not recite a separate processor for running the application program that is in a separate processor for the decoding process. Thus, it is clear that neither the Ng patent nor the Iverson, et al. patent discloses all of the elements in the claims.


In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to show that there is a suggestion in either of the patents to make the suggested combination or that there is a

Appl. No.: 09/833,173
Amdt. dated: 1/25/2006
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2005

reasonable expectation or success of the combination. Moreover, as mentioned above, the Iverson, et al. patent actually teaches away from the invention recited in the claims at issue. For all of the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By: 
John S. Paniaguas

Registration No.: 31,051

Date: 1-25-06

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 West Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693
Tel: (312) 902-5200
Fax: (312) 902-1061

Page 6 of 6